

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated May 16, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 9-15 are rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1-8 are allowed. With this response, claims 9 and 10 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-15 remain pending in this application. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 1-8 are allowed.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR § 1.83(a) as to failing to show the feature “transferring some of the colored inks filled in the grooves of the cliché from the cliché”. Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the amendments in claim 9, this drawing objection is believed to be moot.

In the Office Action, claims 9, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as falling to comply with written description requirement. In view of claims as presently amended, applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The claims have been amended to comply with written description requirement, as required by the Examiner in the Office Action.

In the Office Action, claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Publication No. JP2001166322 to Higuchi (hereinafter “Higuchi”). Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higuchi in view of U. S. Patent Application No. 2003/0118922 to Hayashi et al (hereinafter “Hayashi”). Claims 9, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,514,503 to Evans (hereinafter “Evans”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,673,252 to Kugo et al. (hereinafter “Kugo”) and Japanese Patent Publication No. JP11-326621 to Aoki et al. (hereinafter “Aoki”).

The rejection of claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Higuchi is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 10 is allowable at least in that this claim recites a combination of elements, including, for example, “Red, Green and Blue color filters on the active area of the substrate”

and “Red, Green and Blue dummy color filters on the dummy area of the substrate”. Higuchi does not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

The Examiner states in the rejection that Higuchi teaches: “Red, Green and Blue color filters on the active area and the dummy area of the substrate (17a and Figure 1)”. However, Higuchi fails to teach the Red, Green and Blue dummy color filters on the dummy area of the substrate. Reference number 17a in the Higuchi is Red, Green, Blue color filter pixels in the active area, not the Red, Green, Blue color filter pixels in the dummy area. See Paragraph [0022]. That is, in Higuchi only Red, Green, Blue color filter pixels are not formed in the dummy area. Only one color filter layer 17, not three color filter pixels, is formed in the dummy area in Higuchi. Thus, applicants submit that Higuchi does not teach at least “Red, Green and Blue dummy color filters on the dummy area of the substrate” as recited in claim 10.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 11-12 and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 11-12 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 10, which is allowable.

The rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higuchi in view of Hayashi is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. . Claims 13 is allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 10, which is allowable, and Hayashi fails to cure the deficiencies of Higuchi described above.

The rejection of claims 9, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans in view of Kugo and Aoki is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 9 is allowable at least in that this claim recites a combination of elements, including, for example, “providing a substrate which is divided into an active area that contains pixels for realizing image and a dummy area in the periphery of the active area that does not contain pixels for realizing image” and “applying the Red, Green and Blue colored inks on the printing roll onto the active area and the dummy area of the substrate by rotating the printing roll across the substrate to form respectively the Red, Green and Blue color filters and the Red, Green and Blue dummy color filters in the active area and the dummy area”. The cited references do not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

In the section of the Office Action identifying allowable subject matter, the Examiner states “Regarding claim 1, the prior art does not teach or render obvious a method of fabricating a color filter for a LCD device comprising providing a substrate which is divided into an active area that contains pixels for realizing an image and dummy area in the periphery of the active area that does not contain pixels for realizing an image”.

Applicants respectfully agree with the Examiner’s statement and thus applicants submit that the cited references do not teach at least “providing a substrate which is divided into an active area that contains pixels for realizing image and a dummy area in the periphery of the active area that does not contain pixels for realizing image” as recited in claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 14 and 15 and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 14 and 15 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 9, which is allowable.

Applicants believe the above amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

**Application No. 10/602,744  
Amdt. dated August 15, 2007  
Office Action dated May 16, 2007**

**Docket No. 8733.849.00**

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: August 15, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By:

  
Valerie P. Hayes  
Registration No.: 53,005  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.,  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicants

Application No. 10/602,744  
Amdt. dated August 15, 2007  
Office Action dated May 16, 2007

Docket No. 8733.849.00

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: August 15, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Valerie P. Hayes  
Registration No.: 53,005  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.,  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicants